DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 610 88 CS 001 306

TITLE Project READ.
INSTITUTION Inglewood Unified School District, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Grades; Individualized Reading; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Programed Instruction; Reading; *Reading Difficulty; *Reading Failure; Reading Improvement; Reading Materials; *Reading Programs; Reading Skills; Secondary Grades
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

This project demonstrates an individualized continuous progress reading program for pupils identified as educationally disadvantaged in reading. The program uses Sullivan reading materials, supplemented by other reading activities according to individual need. A daily programed individualized reading period was provided and teachers and aides assisted individual pupils as needed. The major objective of the project was to reduce the number of children who were reading below grade level at the project target schools. Activities specifically designed to meet the objective include: providing facilities, personnel, and materials; selecting pupils who met the project criteria; providing inservice training for project teachers concerning the use of Behavioral Research Laboratories reading materials; evaluating pupil needs and prescribing a related program; and providing continuous monitoring of pupil progress. The evaluation findings indicated that project pupils, especially those in kindergarten and grades 1 and 2, were by and large meeting major and specific performance objectives; criterion-referenced progress test objectives were all being met; and the number of children reading below grade level was reduced considerably. (WR)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

California State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

Bureau of Instructional Program Planning and Development

RECEIVED
JUL 3 1973
ESEA, Title III

ESEA TITLE III STATISTICAL DATA
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
(P.L. 89-10 as amended by P.L. 90-247)

ED 096610

CS

THIS SPACE FOR STATE USE ONLY →	County	District Code	Project #	Type	

SECTION A - PROJECT INFORMATION

1. REASON FOR SUBMISSION OF THIS FORM (Check one)
A [ ] INITIAL APPLICATION FOR TITLE III GRANT OR RESUBMISSION
B [ ] APPLICATION FOR CONTINUATION GRANT
C [X] Final Project Report

2. IN ALL CASES EXCEPT INITIAL APPLICATION, GIVE ASSIGNED PROJECT NUMBER: 19-0403

3. MAJOR DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: (Check one only)
A [ ] INNOVATIVE C [ ] ADAPTIVE
B [X] EXEMPLARY

4. TYPE(S) OF ACTIVITY (Check one or more)
A [ ] PLANNING OF PROGRAM
B [ ] PLANNING OF CONSTRUCTION
C [X] CONDUCTING PILOT ACTIVITIES
D [X] OPERATION OF PROGRAM
E [ ] CONSTRUCTING
F [ ] REMODELING

5. PROJECT TITLE (5 Words or Less)
PROJECT "READ"

6. BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND GIVE THE ITEM NUMBER OF THE AREA OF MAJOR EMPHASIS AS LISTED IN SEC. 303, P.L. 89-10. (See instructions)

Project "Read" provides a demonstration program in individualized instruction in physically and educationally disadvantaged students who, without the program, would be unlikely to achieve success. The project utilizes a plan for teacher training, parent involvement and individualized instruction, based upon a combination of Behavioral Research programmed and other supplemental material.

ITEM NUMBER 3

7. NAME OF APPLICANT (Local Education Agency)	8. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code)	
INGLEWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	401 South Inglewood Avenue, Inglewood, California 90301	
9. NAME OF COUNTY: Los Angeles	10. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 31 and 37	
11. NAME OF PROJECT DIRECTOR: Dr. Leonard Swenson	12. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code) (Bus.): 401 South Inglewood Avenue, Inglewood, California 90301	PHONE NUMBER (Bus.): 673-3110, Ext. 412; AREA CODE: 213
13. Name of Authorized Agent: Dr. William Purdy, Superintendent	14. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code) (Bus.): 401 South Inglewood Avenue, Inglewood, California 90301	PHONE NUMBER (Bus.): 673-3110, Ext. 208; AREA CODE: 213
15. POSITION OR TITLE: Superintendent of Schools		
Signature of Authorized Agent: William P. Purdy		DATE SUBMITTED: 6/29/73

CS 001306

SECTION A – Continued

16. LIST THE NUMBER OF EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT SERVED	17A. TOTAL NUMBER OF COUNTIES SERVED	18. LATEST AVERAGE PER PUPIL ADA EXPENDITURE OF LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES SERVED
31 and 37	1	$ 1022.
	B. TOTAL NUMBER OF LEA'S SERVED: 1	
	C. TOTAL ESTIMATED POPULATION IN GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED: 88,781	

SECTION B – TITLE III BUDGET SUMMARY FOR PROJECT (Include amount from item 2c below)

1.		PREVIOUS OE GRANT NUMBER	BEGINNING DATE (Month, Year)	ENDING DATE (Month, Year)	FUNDS REQUESTED
A.	Initial Application or Resubmission		7/1/70	6/30/71	$ 33,351.50
B.	Application for First Continuation Grant		7/1/71	6/30/72	$ 35,538.00
C.	Application for Second Continuation Grant	0403	7/1/72	6/30/73	$ 38,345.14
D.	Total Title III Funds				$107,234
E.	End of Budget Period Report		5/73	6/73	

2. *Complete the following items only if this project includes construction, acquisition, remodeling, or leasing of facilities for which Title III funds are requested. Leave blank if not appropriate.*

A. *Type of function (Check applicable boxes)*

1 ☐ REMODELING OF FACILITIES 2 ☐ LEASING OF FACILITIES 3 ☐ ACQUISITION OF FACILITIES

4 ☐ CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES 5 ☐ ACQUISITION OF BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT

B. 1. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE PROPOSED FACILITY	2. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE FACILITY TO BE USED FOR TITLE III PROGRAMS	C. AMOUNT OF TITLE III FUNDS REQUESTED FOR FACILITY
		$

SECTION C - PROJECT CLASSIFICATION

1. Project Subjects

- 1.1 [X] - Language Arts (Development)
- 1.2 [ ] - Fine Arts
- 1.3 [ ] - Foreign Language
- 1.4 [ ] - Mathematics
- 1.5 [ ] - Science
- 1.6 [ ] - Social Science, Humanities
- 1.7 [ ] - P.E., Recreation, and Health
- 1.8 [ ] - Vocational Education
- 1.9 [ ] - Other

2. Handicapped Education

- 2.1 [ ] - Mentally Retarded
- 2.2 [ ] - Hard of Hearing
- 2.3 [ ] - Deaf
- 2.4 [ ] - Speech Impaired
- 2.5 [ ] - Visually Handicapped
- 2.6 [ ] - Seriously Emotionally Disturbed
- 2.7 [ ] - Crippled
- 2.8 [ ] - Other Health Impaired

3. Guidance, Counseling, and Testing

- 3.1 [ ] - Counseling with Handicapped
- 3.2 [ ] - Group Guidance Activities
- 3.3 [ ] - Group Counseling
- 3.4 [ ] - Career Guidance and Counseling
- 3.5 [ ] - Counseling with Special Problems
- 3.6 [ ] - Use of Paraprofessionals
- 3.7 [ ] - Parent Conferences
- 3.8 [ ] - Follow-up and Drop-out Studies
- 3.9 [ ] - Inservice Training
- 3.10 [ ] - Use of Community Resources
- 3.11 [ ] - Curriculum Development
- 3.12 [ ] - General Counseling
- 3.13 [ ] - Consultation with Teachers
- 3.14 [ ] - Program Evaluation and Development

4. Grade Levels

- 4.1 [ ] - Preschool (indicate ages 3 or 4) _____
- 4.2 [X] - Elementary (indicate grades K-6) K-3
- 4.3 [ ] - Secondary (indicate grades 7-12) _____
- 4.4 [ ] - Junior College (indicate grades 13-14) _____
- 4.5 [ ] - Adult

5. Is your project an adoption or adaptation of another Title III project? [ ] Yes [X] No

If yes, name the agency operating the project: _____

_____

COVER PAGE

for Component II

Data for U. S. Office of Education

(To be completed for all projects active for any period between July 1972 - Through June 30, 1973. Agencies having more than one project must prepare a report for each project.)

Enter information for items 1 through 7.

1. 19-0403
Project No.

2. PROJECT "READ"
Project Title

3. Inglewood Unified School District
Local Educational Agency

401 South Inglewood Avenue

Inglewood, California 90301
Address

4. Leonard E. Swenson
Name of school official responsible for this report

(213) 673-3110
Phone No.

5. Leonard E. Swenson
Name of Project Director

(213) 673-3110
Phone No.

6. The 1972-73 school year has been .....

6.1 [ ] The first year of operation.

6.2 [ ] The second year of operation.

6.3 [X] The third year of operation.

7. Enter the following ending dates:

Ending date for first year 6/30/71

Ending date for second year 6/30/72

Ending date for third and final year 6/30/73

PART I - STAFF DEVELOPMENT

4

The report should describe project staff development activities that took place during the period July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973. If no project staff development activities occurred, write NONE in the first column. Staff development activities are those inservice efforts designed to improve competencies of the staff working full or part-time on the project. Enter the figures in columns two and three.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OF ONE OR MORE DAYS DURATION 1972-73					
(1)	(2)	(3) No. of workshops, conferences and seminars held by type of training			
Definition of Staff: (Staff includes all personnel assigned to work on the project full or part time, whether paid by the district or the project.)	Total No. of participants (Unduplicated) in all activities.	Dissemination to spread information about project	Evaluation to appraise progress	Combination of dissemination & evaluation	Other, such as in-service education. Specify (Use back of this page.)
	59			2	

PART II - EXTENT OF ADOPTION/ADAPTION

1972-1973

The purpose of this section is to find out how many projects are being continued to some extent by the grantee or by other school districts after federal funds have expired.

The report should be limited to projects for which federal funds expired during the period July 1, 1972 through June 30, 1973. If the grantee district expects to continue the project to some extent during the next fiscal year, this should be reported by marking the box. The estimated extent of adoption or adaption by the grantee district should be shown by circling the appropriate percentage figure in the scale.

1. The project is being continued by the grantee in some form after federal funds expired. [X] Yes [ ] No

2. If the answer is YES, draw a circle around the one figure which best represents your estimate of the degree of adoption/adaption of the project in your school district.

20% 30% (40%) 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

3. Is the project being adopted or adapted by other school districts?

[X] Yes [ ] No Unknown

4. If the answer is YES, list the school districts by name and address:

4.1 Los Angeles

4.2 Santa Maria

4.3 Alum Rock

4.4 San Francisco

4.5 Oakland

4.6 Pittsburg

4.7

4.8

4.9

4.10

4.11

4.12

4.13

4.14

4.15

4.16

4.17

4.18

4.19

4.20

Title III Areas of Influence*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C

As Project Director and/or after consultation with district or county personnel involved:

1. Name Juan Salinda Title Evaluator
2. Name John Fosterling Title Principal, Kelso School
3. Name Jesse Herbst Title Principal, Freeman School

Please rank the impact of this ESEA, Title III project on your local educational agency (LEA). Leave blank any items that do not apply and add other categories as desired. Rank items 1 to 7 (or more if you have made additions to the list). Give examples only on items ranked 1 and 2. Number 1 indicates that throughout the LEA the impact was greatest in developing skill areas or additudinal changes in:

Rank**		Examples
3	Special project development Needs assessment, goal setting, planning (writing), implementation, etc.	Use this space to give examples of items ranked 1 and 2. 1. Workshops, individual consultation, observation and other staff training activities gave staff individualization skills they could use in other curriculum areas. 2. Products developed: Skills of individualization and use of aides has been very helpful in the mathematics and other curricular areas.
1	Staff training Resulting in added skills or attitudinal change	
5	Parental involvement in the schools Bringing parents into more direct contact with school activities	
7	Community involvement Instances of community participation other than parents	
6	Evaluation competencies and use of evaluation information	
2	Products developed Have the products developed by the project, i.e., Materials: curriculum guides, AV materials, etc. Methods: individualized instructions, use of aides, etc.: been put to use beyond project requirement? List under examples.	
4	Management and accounting procedures Have the project activities resulted in increased accountability in other learning situations? List under examples.	
_____	Other - Please explain	

* As a result of participation in ESEA, Title III endeavors

** Information derived will indicate areas of greatest impact - Number 1 most impact Number 7 (or more) least impact.

PART III - EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION

1972-1973

The purpose of this part of the report is to find out the actual direct or indirect participation of public and private school pupils and adults in the project during the 1972-73 operational period.

Any participation should be reported only once. The count should be based on actual participation during the 1972-73 school year. The numbers are almost certain to be different from those anticipated in the project application.

The United States Office of Education definitions should be applied:

Direct Participation - Enter the number of different persons participating in activities involving face-to-face interaction of pupils and teachers designed to produce learning, in a classroom, a center or mobile unit; or receiving other special services.

Indirect Participation - Enter the number of different persons visiting or viewing exhibits, demonstrations, museum displays; using materials or equipment developed or purchased by the project; attending performances of plays, symphonies, etc.; viewing television instruction in a school, a center, or home; or participating in other similar activities. Carefully prepared estimates are acceptable.

Elementary - For reporting purposes only, consider elementary as being Prekindergarten through Grade 6.

Secondary - For reporting purposes only, consider secondary as being Grades 7 through 12.

Please supply the information requested for the project.

Table A

Number of Public and Nonpublic School Teachers, and Counselors Participating

Schools (a)	Staff whose students were direct participants				Staff whose students were indirect participants			
	Teachers		Counselors		Teachers		Counselors	
	Elementary (b)	Secondary (c)	Elementary (d)	Secondary (e)	Elementary (f)	Secondary (g)	Elementary (h)	Secondary (i)
Public	39		3		109			1
Nonpublic	6		0		9			

PART III (Continued) **BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

The totals in the following 4 tables must agree one with the other. Also, do not use duplicated figures in the first 4 tables. The target population must be represented by the figures when direct participants are reported. See definitions for direct and indirect in Part III.

Table I

a. Program Select the program of your project. Use "other" category if none apply.	b. Check (✓) program area(s) covered	c. No. of public school students directly participating	d. Amount granted this past year
Reading	X	1191	$38,345.14
Environment/Ecology			
Equal Educational Opportunity			
Model Cities (Urban, Inner-City)			
Gifted			
Handicapped			
Guidance and Counseling			
Drug Education			
Early Childhood Education (Kindergarten and below)			
Ocher Programs			
	Total	1191	

Table II

Provide unduplicated counts of students by grade levels. See instructions below:

	a. School Enrollment		b. Direct Project Participants		c. Indirect Project Participants		d.	e.
	Public	Nonpublic	Public	Nonpublic	Public	Nonpublic		
Pre K								
K	892		235		100			400
1	900	65	273	65	125			500
2	960	74	247	74	125			500
3	983	74	223	74	125			500
4	923	80						
5	997	76						
6	1015	74						
7	968	75						
8	975	76						
9	1027							
10	1028							
11	1001							
12	806							
Ungraded	166							
TOTALS	12641	594	962		475		385	1900

Column a. Include the total enrollment in the local educational agency.
Column b. Include only the target population.
Column b. & c. See definitions of direct and indirect for both columns.
Column d. Include an estimate of the number of target population students who have been in the project since its inception. A cumulative total of all years is requested. Provide an unduplicated count; therefore, do not count any student more than once.
Column e. Include an estimate of the number of students within the local educational agency who have not been directly serviced by the project, but would benefit from direct participation because they fit the description of the target population.

Table III

Rural/Urban Distribution of Public School, Direct Participants Served by Project - Enter Number of Each Category. See definitions at bottom of page.

Rural		Metropolitan			Total of all Categories
Farm	Non Farm	Low Socio-Economic	Other	Other Urban	
		300	891		1191

Table IV

Distribution of Public School, Direct Participants by Project - Enter Number of Each Group.

Negro	American Indian	Spanish Surname	Oriental	White	Other Nonwhite	Total of all groups
491	11	78	8	582	21	1191

Recap of Totals for Tables I, II, III and IV.

Total of Column c., Table I	1191
Total of Column b. (Public School), Table II	1191
Total of All Categories, Table III	1191
Total of All Groups, Table IV	1191

The totals on each line above should agree one with the other.

Definitions:

Rural means an outlying area of less than 2,500 inhabitants.
Low socio-economic means an area of low socio-economic level within a city of 50,000 inhabitants or more.
Other means areas in cities of 50,000 or more inhabitants which are other than low socio-economic areas.
Other Urban means areas (including suburbs) with less than 50,000 but more than 2,500 inhabit[redacted]

Table V

Provide Number of Schools in the Project.

	Public	Nonpublic
Elementary	4	1
Secondary		

Table VI

Number of Students Served Directly by Unique Target Populations (Figures may be duplicated)

Students (a)	Indians (b)	Migrants (c)	Disadvantaged (d)	Handicapped (e)	Childhood Education (Kgtn.& Below) (f)	Other Target Populations (See note below) (g)
Number of Students	11	0	209	64	235	144

Note for Column (g) check populations included in the number entered above.

78 Children from non-English speaking environment.

12 Neglected and delinquent children.

51 Gifted 3 N.H. _____ EMR _____ Dropouts

_____ Other (specify) _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART IV - STAFF PARTICIPATION/HIGHER EDUCATION COOPERATION

Table VII

Complete the table below as directed. Compute full time equivalent (F.T.E.) according to the instructions under the table.

Paid staff are district personnel who receive remuneration from Title III funds.
Unpaid staff are district personnel who do not receive renumeration from Title III funds but give service to the project.
Ungraded classes are included in Other category.

Type of Paid and Unpaid Personnel By Function	Number of Paid Staff Assigned to Project (F.T.E.)	Number of Unpaid Staff Assigned to Project (F.T.E.)
Administrators and/or supervisors		.6
Teachers		
Prekindergarten		
Kindergarten		3
Other elementary 1-6		10
Secondary 7-12		
Other		
Subject matter specialists		
Technicians		
Pupil personnel workers		1
Health services personnel		
Researchers and evaluators		.1
Planners and developers		
Disseminators		
Other professionals		
Paraprofessional education aides, etc.	8	
Other nonprofessional		.1

To compute full-time equivalent (F.T.E.), add the total number of hours worked per week by the personnel and divide by the number of hours in your regular full-time work week. For example: If each of four staff members works 20 hours per week, each of two staff members works ten hours per week, and each of ten staff members works full time (assume 40 hours for this example), the total hours worked would be 80 plus 20 plus 400, or 500 hours. This total of 500 hours divided by 40 yields an F.T.E. figure of 12.5.

Table VIII

Complete as directed.

Number of consultants paid by Title III funds 4
Number of consultant days paid for by Title III funds 50

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART IV (Continued)

Table IX

Complete as directed for the 1972-73 term.

Number of public school professional staff who attended Title III Inservice:

		Estimate Carefully Title III Funds Spent on Training
Orientation sessions up to one week's duration	0	$ 0
Inservice workshops in regular term of one session to four-weeks' duration	42	$ 2500
Inservice workshops in regular term over four-weeks' duration	0	$ 0
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 one session to four-weeks' duration	0	$ 0
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 over four-weeks' duration	0	$ 0
College credit courses - regular term	0	$ 0
College credit courses - summer term	0	$ 0

Number of aides (nonprofessional staff) who attended Title III Inservice:

Inservice workshops in regular term of one session to four-weeks' duration	8	$ 500
Inservice workshops in regular term over four-weeks' duration	0	$ 0
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 one session to four-weeks' duration	0	$ 0
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 over four-weeks' duration	0	$ 0
College credit courses - regular term	0	$ 0
College credit courses - summer term	0	$ 0

PART IV (Continued)

Table X

Complete as directed.

Number of nonpublic school professional staff involved in Title III inservice in the 1972-73 term 6.

Table XI

Enter number of teachers, aides, and students involved in a Title III, 1972, summer school designed to provide instruction to students.

None

Grades	Pre K	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	> 10	11	12
Teachers														
Aides														
Students														

You and/or members of your Project staff may have worked with higher education personnel during the 1972-73 project year (last year). We are interested in the type (formal and informal), and the extent (cost and hours) of any cooperation. Formal participation refers to services performed with remuneration. Informal participation refers to help without remuneration. Please estimate the cost and number of man-days associated with each of the following:

(a) Identifying and/or developing desirable content or educational procedures to be used (program development).
(1) $ 0 cost; (2) number of man-days: 0 formal and 0 informal

(b) Search for evaluation help, i.e., for instruments or procedures to be used for evaluation.
(1) $ 0 cost; (2) number of man-days: 0 formal and 0 informal

(c) Planning and/or implementing staff development programs (inservice training for project staff).
(1) $ 0 cost; (2) number of man-days: 0 formal and 0 informal

(d) Please indicate any other participation.

None

(1) $_____ cost; (2) number of man-days: _____ formal and ___ informal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HANDICAPPED PROJECT PARTICIPATION ONLY - ESEA TITLE III

1. HANDICAPPED CHILDREN SERVED, PERSONNEL PAID, AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING RECEIVED WITH ESEA TITLE III FUNDS

TYPE OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN SERVED*	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED					FULL-TIME EQUIVALENCE OF PROJECT PERSONNEL PAID WITH TITLE III FUNDS				PERSONNEL RECEIVING IN-SERVICE TRAINING WITH TITLE III FUNDS			
	5-5 YEARS	6-12 YEARS	13-18 YEARS	19 & OVER	TOTAL	TEACHERS	TEACHER AIDES	OTHER	TOTAL	TEACHERS	TEACHER AIDES	OTHER	TOTAL
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)
(1) TMR													
(2) EMR													
(3) HH													
(4) DEAF													
(5) SI													
(6) VI													
(7) ED													
(8) CR	12	52				1.5	.38		1.88	5	1		6
(9) LD													
(10) OHI													
(11) TOTAL													

2. NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN SERVED WHO ATTEND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS: 0

3. DISTRIBUTION BY ETHNIC GROUPS

POPULATION	NEGRO	INDIAN	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAME	WHITE (Other than Spanish surname)	OTHER	TOTAL
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
Student Participants	6	0	2	3	53		64

4. CHILDREN RECEIVING SERVICES - DISTRIBUTION BY DEMOGRAPHIC AREA

CATEGORY		NUMBER
(1) Urban Areas (over 50,000)	X	64
(2) Rural Areas (under 2,500)		
(3) Other Demographic Areas (from 2,500-50,000)		
(4) TOTAL (Sum of lines (1), (2), and (3))		64

INSTRUCTIONS

1. **CHILDREN SERVED** – Enter in the appropriate columns b, c, d, and e an unduplicated count of children served by type of primary handicap *(in public and non-public schools)* and by age group who received direct instructional or related services with Title III funds. This count should include all handicapped children *(1)* who received direct services from personnel paid with Title III funds and/or *(2)* who received substantial benefit as a result of the purchase or projects equipment or the provision of significant in-service training of personnel with Title III funds. Do not include handicapped children who received only incidental services, such as preliminary vision screening or audiological testing, etc. Column f should equal columns b, c, d, and e.

   PROJECT PERSONNEL – Enter in the appropriate columns g, h, and i corresponding with the primary type of handicapped children served a figure representing an unduplicated count of the full-time personnel plus the full-time equivalency of part-time personnel paid from Title III funds. Full-time personnel are those personnel who were assigned to Title III project activities 40 hours or more per week *(or the number of hours in a regular work week, as determined by the State or local education agency)*. They may be school year, summer program, or 12-month personnel. Column j should equal columns g, h, and i.

   IN-SERVICE TRAINING – Enter in the appropriate columns k, l, and m corresponding with primary type of handicapped children served an unduplicated count of all personnel who receive in-service training with Title III funds. Column n should equal columns k, l, and m.

2. **NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS** – Of the total number of handicapped children served with Title III funds *(1,11), (f)*, indicate the number who attended non-public schools.

3. **DISTRIBUTION BY ETHNIC GROUPS** – Enter in the appropriate columns b, c, d, e, f, and g an undiplicated count of the handicapped children served with Title III funds by ethnic group membership. Column h should equal columns b, c, d, e, f, and g.

4. **DISTRIBUTION BY DEMOGRAPHIC AREAS** – Self-explanatory.

* TMR – Trainable Mentally Retarded; EMR – Educable Mentally Retarded; HH – Hard of Hearing; SI–Speech Impaired; VI – Visually Impaired; ED – Emotionally Disturbed; CR – Crippled; LD – Learning Disabled; OHI – Other Health Impaired

GRANTEE INGLEWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

PROJECT ABSTRACTS (ESEA, Title III)	STATE	TOTAL PROJECT PERIOD	FROM (Month and year)	TO (Month and year)	PROJECT NO.
	California		Sept.1,1970	June 30,1973	19-0403

NOTE: If project involves handicapped children and/or personnel working with handicapped children who are paid from Title III funds, complete the information on the back of this form.

TITLE OF PROJECT
PROJECT "READ"

GRANTEE
INGLEWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

PROJECTED FUNDING LEVEL FOR PROJECT PERIOD	19 70	19 71	19 72	19 —	19 —	19 —
	$ 33351	$ 35538	$ 38345	$	$	$

TARGET POPULATION Approximately 1250 balanced minority and sex Kindergarten to Third graders from low-middle to upper-middle backgrounds.

PARAGRAPH DESCRIPTION In general, this project demonstrates an individualized continuous progress reading program, for pupils identified as educationally disadvantaged in reading, with the use of Sullivan reading materials published by Behavioral Research Labs, supplemented by other reading activities according to individual need.

A daily programmed individualized reading period is provided. Teachers and Aides assist individual pupils as needed. Self-testing and progress recording by pupils. Periodic progress tests. Reteaching as needed.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES

To significantly reduce the number of children who are reading below grade level at project target schools.

ACTIVITIES TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES

1. Providing facilities, personnel and materials needed.
2. Selecting pupils who meet project criteria.
3. In-service training for project teachers concerning use of Behavioral Research Laboratories reading materials.
4. Evaluating pupil needs and prescribing related program.
5. Continuous monitoring of pupil progress.
6. Communication with parents regarding pupil progress.

EVALUATION STRATEGY Pupil progress measured by Behavioral Research Lab Primary and Progress tests, Metropolitan Readiness Test, and Cooperative Primary Reading Test. Baseline data for continuing pupils is provided by prior year's test results. Gains are measured by end-of-year testing. New students are pre-tested.

EVALUATION FINDINGS From our objective and BRL test data, our project pupils, especially in regard to Kindergarten, Grades 1 and 2, were by and large meeting major and specific performance objectives taking errors of measurement into consideration. Criterion-referenced progress test objectives were all being met. Non-objective data, as well as monitoring visits, confirm impact of the project. Strong support for it has come from parents, pupils, teachers and administrators. The number of children, who are reading below grade level, are ~~being~~ reduced considerably.

15a

PART VI - PRODUCTS OF PROJECT

	I Product(s) Developed	II Date mailed to Title III	III Annotations
X	Curriculum guides		Developed by Behavioral Research Lab
X	Teacher guides		Developed by Behavioral Research Lab
X	Handbooks of materials, techniques, and procedures		Developed by Behavioral Research Lab
	Monograph		
	Bibliography		
X	Questionnaires - locally developed	4/72	See Appendix of Application for Teacher & parent ques-
X	Evaluation tests		BLR Progress Tests [tionnaire and Visitor's checklist
	Audio tape cassettes		
X	Brochures, newsletters and information sheets	7/71	Teacher and Parent Newsletters
	16 mm Films		
	8 mm Films		
	Filmstrips		
X	Instructional workbooks, materials,	7/71	Student dictionaries and reading games
	Tests - locally developed		
	Kits		
	Models		
	Microcards		
	Microfilm		
	Maps		
	Pictures		
	Posters		
	Records		
	Set		
	Slides/tape		
	Viewmasters		
X	Video Tape	7/71	
	(Other)_____		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		

CONTEXT

The Locale

1. What is the locale of the program?
2. What is the density of the population?
3. What are the population trends?
4. What are the major occupations of people in the locale?
5. What is the unemployment rate or trend?
6. What proportion of families in the locale are receiving welfare assistance?

Inglewood is located eight miles southwest of downtown Los Angeles and approximately three miles northwest of the Los Angeles International Airport. It is bordered by Los Angeles to the east, northeast, and west, where it adjoins the Los Angeles community of Westchester. Lennox and Hawthorne border Inglewood on the southwest and south.

Inglewood is a changing community and school district. In the 1940's medium and small homes predominated in Inglewood, and few apartment houses or multiple dwellings existed. Recent trends have included an increase in apartments, an increase in the number of older individuals living in the City, and a rapidly changing ethnic composition. Today 42% of the dwellings are single family and 58% are multiple units. The City is a stable, established community with an increasingly more dense and rapidly growing minority population.

The people in the locale are engaged in a wide variety of occupations (business, industry, health and governmental service). In the region, the economy is dependent considerably on airospace-defense contracts.

During the past few years, property values have been decreasing due to the changing population, increasing incidence of crime, increasing poverty index (23.55%), high unemployment rate (15.2% for the 16 to 24 age), and high noise level (due to aircraft).

The School System

1. What grade levels do the schools serve?
2. How many pupils are there in the school system? How many schools?
3. Are there any significant trends in the school system in enrollment, withdrawal, or transfer?
4. What is the per pupil cost of education in the school system?
5. What is the recent financial history of the school system?

Grade levels kindergarten through 12 are included in the District. There are 12,533 pupils in 13 elementary, two junior high, two high school and one continuation high school. There has been a rapid change in the ethnic composition of the Inglewood schools -- from 20.5 minority pupils in October, 1967 to 58.7% in October, 1972. The transiency rate has increased considerably due to unstable employment and more residents becoming renters rather than homeowners. According to the most recent statistics, the per pupil cost for education in Inglewood is $1022. Though Inglewood has spent more than State average per pupil in the past, the tax base is eroding and the community is finding it more difficult to support any increases in school support. Though the income and expenditures are about at State average, most of the facilities are badly in need of modernization and repair.

Needs Assessment

1. What was the starting point for needs assessment?
2. How were the specific needs of the pupils identified?
3. What were these specific needs? Which were selected for the program?

Prior to the submission of the original application for this project in January, 1970, a comprehensive needs assessment had been completed based upon input from standardized test results, staff survey and parent opinions. From the data, it was obvious there was a critical problem concerning the number of pupils reading below grade level.

Many factors have caused the need or problem, including changes in the socio-ethnic-economic structure of the District population, influx of numerous ex-Cubans without prior English language experience, increased transiency, and influx of many pupils with limited language experience or previous failure in their school-related language development.

It was determined that considerable improvement was needed in skills of teachers related to specific areas of teaching reading (particularly word analysis), and that previous methods and materials of instruction were not yielding desired results.

Despite efforts to meet these growing needs through after-school reading clinics, reading in-service education, and development of a teacher's reading guide for use with new State textbooks, the number of children needing help continued to increase.

Target schools were selected for participation in the project based on extent of the problem or needs, non-participation in compensatory education program, a conviction that needs should be attacked first at the earliest educational levels, interest in establishing a successful reading program model for helping pupils with diverse handicaps or needs, and commitment of school staff to the proposed program. The target schools selected were: Freeman (grades K - 2), Kelso (grades K - 3), and Highland (grade 3) from this District, a Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools administered school for orthopedically handicapped pupils (grades K - 3), and a parochial school -- St. John's Chrysostom (grades 1 - 3).

Historical Background

1. Did the program exist prior to the time period covered in the present report?
2. Is the program a modification of a previously existing program?
3. How did the program originate?
4. If special problems were encountered in gaining acceptance of the program by parents and the community, how were these solved so that the program could be introduced?
5. Provide a brief history of planning. Indicate which planning efforts were successful or were not successful. Describe how non-profit private schools and other agencies were involved in the planning.

The program did not exist prior to the inception of the Title III grant, nor was it a modification of a previous existing program. The program originated as a result of a needs assessment which revealed an excessive number of pupils reading below grade level, a high level of pupil transiency, and a poor pupil/teacher/parent about the reading program. A task force was organized, including the Elementary Coordinator, District Evaluator, and principals of schools where needs were not being addressed adequately. This task force operated under the general direction of the Assistant Superintendent - Instruction. After various alternate programs had been studied, including visitation to schools where BRL and other programs were in use, it was decided to apply for ESEA, Title III funding, using the BRL materials. The task force was augumented to include a principal of an interested non-public private school and a consultant from BRL. This committee planned the program, including an agreement concerning the evaluation design to be used (C.I.P.P.).

Prior to the inception of the program, all parents of the proposed project participants were invited to orientation meetings. There were only a couple of parents who objected to their children participating in this program. In each case, an alternate reading program was made available which resolved the program amicably. Follow-up teacher/parent/administrator evaluations has indicated continued enthusiastic support for the program.

PROGRAM

Scope of the Program

1. What numbers and kinds of participants were served by the program?
2. What were the specified objectives of the program?

Project READ services 1252 diverse types of kindergarten through third grade pupils (orthopedically handicapped, English as a Second Language, educationally disadvantaged, general education, mentally retarded, non-public school pupils) in five project schools involving the use of the Sullivan Behavioral Research Laboratories reading program including: diagnosing pupil reading skills, cooperative placement in the appropriate unit or learning level of reading/study material, teacher and aide guidance of pupils individually and in small groups, pupils testing and scoring their daily progress, teachers administering periodic tests, and other means of monitoring progress. Supplementary materials and activities may be used to enhance comprehension and interpretation skills or for additional practice. Approximately one hour is scheduled for the reading program daily. Parents are oriented to the program and pupil progress via group and individual conferences and periodic newsletters.

The primary project objective was to significantly reduce the number of children who are reading below grade level at the target schools. Specific reading objectives included:

1. By June 1973, at least 80% of the Kindergarten children who complete the Readiness in Language Arts program will score in the 3rd quartile or above as measured by the Metropolitan Readiness Test.

2. By June 1973, at least 80% of the pupils who completed the Readiness program in Kindergarten will during their second and third years in the program make no less than month-for-month gains after use of the Reading phase, as measured by the Cooperative Primary Test.

3. By June 1973, at least 80% of the first and second grade students who initially require the Readiness in Language Arts program and move on to the Reading series will be achieving month-for-month gains at the end of the first year and be at grade level by the end of their second or third year, as measured by the Cooperative Primary Test.

4. By June 1973, at least 80% of the third grade students who began the Reading Readiness Program in Books A or B will have achieved no less than the average second grade score by the end of their first year in the program, and by the end of their second year in the program, fifty per cent of these students will read at no less than the average fourth grade level, as measured by the Cooperative Primary Test.

5. By June 1973, students who began the program in Book 5 or above will double their rate of growth during the previous academic year in the first year of the project, and during the second and third year, these students will achieve month-for-month gains, as measured by the Cooperative Primary Test.

Personnel

1. What kinds and numbers of personnel were added by the program?
2. What were their most important duties and activities?
3. How much time did each type of personnel devote to these responsibilities?
4. What special qualifications suited personnel to the requirements of their jobs?
5. What special problems were dealt with in recruiting or maintaining staff?

Eight instructional aides were added by the program. They assisted regular classroom teachers meet the needs of individual learners. Aides assisted for approximately one hour in each classroom daily. In some classrooms volunteers assist in lieu of paid aides.

No special qualifications were required for the teachers, other than being open to the use of this continuous progress personalized/individualized program. As the result of in-service education from Behavioral Research Laboratories consultants, whatever skills individual teachers needed to become effective instructional managers or learning facilitators, working in partnership with pupils, were improved. If there were specific needs during the implementation of the program, individual consultation help was available for each teacher. Thus any minor problems could be resolved quickly.

Organizational Details

1. What is the period of time covered by your report?
2. How much of the entire program does this cover?
3. Where were program activities located?
4. What special physical arrangements were used in these locations?
5. What provisions, if any, were made for periodic review of the program?
6. What important decisions were made on the basis of such reviews?
7. What provisions, if any, were made for inservice training?

This report covers a 3 year period. The activities have been located at the same places since the project inception, as listed below:

	Kelso	Freeman	Highland	Orthopedic Unit	St. John
Kindergarten	4	5		1	
1st grade	3	5		2	2
2nd grade	4	5		1	2
3rd grade	4		4	1	2

They function in self-contained classrooms with desk or table individual pupil stations, without any specialized equipment or other resources than the BRL materials.

Program progress was monitored by the project evaluator with cooperative help from principals and BRL consultants. Each classroom was visited semi-annually by one or more of the above. A visitation checklist was used to maintain reliability of information. If adjustments were indicated on the basis of the reviews, those affected (teacher, principal, evaluator and/or consultant) would plan cooperatively whatever changes were needed.

At the inception of the project, all project teachers were oriented to the use of BRL materials and individualization classroom management systems. Follow-up in-service was provided on both a group and individual basis as needed.

Activities or Services

1. What were the main activities (or services) in the program?
2. How were these activities (or services) related to specified program objectives?
3. What methods were used in carrying out each activity (or service)?
4. What was a typical day's or week's schedule of activities for the children (or others) who received the program?
5. How were pupils grouped for the various program activities?
6. What were teacher-pupil ratios (or aid-pupil, or adult-pupil, and so on) in each of these groupings?
7. How did pupils (or others) receive feedback on their individual daily progress?
8. How did parents receive feedback on their child's progress?
9. What amounts and kinds of practice, review, and quiz activities were provided for pupils (or others) in the program?
10. What special provisions were made for motivating pupils (or others)?
11. If a comparison group was used, what were important differences in the activities and methods used in this group and the activities and methods used with the program group?

Project READ services for all kindergarten through third grade pupils in five project schools involve diagnosing pupil reading skills, placement in Sullivan Behavioral Research Laboratory programmed materials, guiding pupils in small groups and individually, and monitoring progress. One teacher and aide will lead each classroom group for approximately one hour daily. Pupils test and score their daily progress. Immediate feedback and success provide further motivation to progress. Periodic progress tests are administered by teachers. Supplementary materials and activity are provided for additional practice or enrichment. Parents are oriented to the program and pupil progress via group and individual conferences and periodic newsletters.

The following major activities were included:

1. To provide physical facilities for development of the reading program: classroom assignments, space for storage of materials.

2. To assign personnel; teachers, teacher aides, selection of a building coordinator.

3. Administrative steps taken to purchase and distribute materials to each project school prior to opening of school.

4. To administer placement examinations to all children in the project classrooms: On a class-by-class basis during the first two weeks of school.

5. To obtain interim reports on student progress by regular testing using in-book and progress tests incorporated in the program materials.

6. Pre-service workshops for all project principals, teachers, and teacher aides using pre-test, post-test procedures. Model classrooms on organization and individualizing instruction presented.

7. Class-by-class in-service provided by the Behavioral Research Laboratories' consultants on classroom organization and individualizing instruction.

Activities or Services cont.

8. Behavioral Research Laboratories' consultants and District personnel to provide continuing in-service sessions.

9. Distribute Project Newsletter to teachers.

10. Video tapes made of teacher-student performance.

11. Visitations and feed-back conferences by District personnel.

12. Design, distribute, receive and evaluate teacher questionnaires to assess effective implementation of program.

Instructional Equipment and Materials

1. Were special materials developed or adapted for the program? How and by whom?
2. What other major items of equipment and materials did the program require? In what amounts?
3. How were key aids and materials used in connection with the various program activities?
4. If a comparison is being made between program and nonprogram persons, were there important differences between these groups in kinds and amounts of materials provided, or in methods of use?

The main type of materials used in the project were the Sullivan Behavioral Research Laboratories reading program. This includes placement tests, programmed texts and accompanying workbooks for each unit and performance objective, related lesson self-tests, unit tests, correlated readers, comprehension readers, and games or other reinforcement aids and activities. Teachers and pupils may select from supplementary media and activities which best fit individual cases. No equipment is required in the program.

Some special materials have been locally-developed in relation to the program, including: pupil dictionaries, individual pupil linguistic progression folders correlated with performance objectives, games and other skills reinforcement materials, and video tapes of classroom performance.

There are some essential differences in this program as compared to other types of group or individualized reading programs. "Project Read" embodies a programmed approach to reading instruction. The effectiveness of the application of programmed reading to classroom instruction is documented by published results of schools and/or districts using the program. This method was selected, after careful analysis of alternatives, for the following reasons:

It is a developmental sequentially structured program with linguistic emphasis. The sequencing is horizontal as well as vertical;

The student works at his own pace;

He participates actively and gets a chance to respond personally and individually;

He experiences success and receives strong reinforcement as his reading improves.

Some consumable materials or work sheets are used in this program, but the costs are comparable to other commercially prepared materials or to costs producing materials locally.

Budget

1. From what sources were program funds obtained?
2. What was the total cost of the program?
3. What period of time was covered by these funds?
4. What is the per pupil cost of the program? What was the formula for computing this figure?
5. How does the per pupil cost of the program compare with the normal per pupil cost of the schools in the program?
6. Where can the reader get more detailed budget information?
7. Of the total cost of the program, give rough dollar estimates of developmental costs, implementation costs and operational costs.
8. Give the costs for the entire project period by budget categories (i.e., professional salaries, contracted services, etc.).

Funds, in addition to the usual District expenditures, for the project were obtained from ESEA, Title III. The total costs over a three year period will have been $108,398 at a per pupil cost of $30.63 (based on 1252 project participants). Approximately three-fifths of the costs have been related to staff development and salaries of teacher aides. It is anticipated that these and administrative costs may be reduced substantially in subsequent years. Use of the project materials may be in lieu of other materials and/or time of personnel and supplies which may balance costs. Detailed budget information is available from Behavioral Research Laboratories.

Estimated costs of the program:

Developmental costs	$1000.
Implementation costs	$5000.
Operation costs	$39,000. annually

Costs for the three year project period:

220 - Instructional aides	$29,766.
291 - Instructional materials and contracted consultant service	75,815.
811 - Fixed charges on salary	1,749.

Parent-Community Involvement

1. What role, if any, did parents have in the program?
2. Were meetings held with parents? Why? How often?
3. What role, if any, did various community groups have in the program?
4. How was the community kept informed?
5. If problems with parents or the community affected the program, what steps, if any, were taken to remedy the situation?

Parents participated in numerous ways in the project:

- Receiving input concerning the educational plans for progress of their children (via English-Spanish newsletters and bulletins; school meetings, open houses and conferences; newspaper articles; Board meetings; video tape presentations of pupil learning activites etc)

- Parent education meetings and workshops concentrating on follow-up reading reinforcement activities.

- Aiding teachers on a volunteer basis via Project Invest (a community based non-profit group assisting in the recruitment, training and placement of volunteer aides)

- English-Spanish classes in local schools.

Prior to the inception of the project, orientation meetings were held with parents with the assistance of BRL consultants. Follow-up meetings were held twice yearly.

Local school advisory committees provided over-all direction for the project. In addition, there were numerous newspaper articles, presentations at PTA, Board of Education, and other community group meetings. A video tape of the program and classroom activities was used as a vehicle for most of the presentations.

Problems of acceptance of the program by the community or by individual parents were almost non-existent. The one or two parents at each school who preferred to not have their child participate, were allowed the option of an alternate program without any type of discrimination.

In general, the community has enthusiastically endorsed the project as may be evidenced by the parent evaluation.

Special Factors

For use of potential adopters of the program:

1. What modifications of the program are possible?
2. What are the suggested steps in adopting this program?
3. What are some things others should avoid in adopting this program?
4. Can the program be phased in, beginning on a small scale? How?
5. Can parts of the program be adopted without taking the whole program? What parts?

This program can be modified in the following ways:

- Though the BRL program should be used as the basic instructional approach for pupil learning of decoding and other word attack skills, pupils may be assigned to alternate programs after they have completed book 12. This would occur at approximately the latter half of the second grade.

- Many types of supplementary programs can be used, such as group basal readers, language experience, linguistic, or self-selection and individualized reading.

The following steps are suggested in adopting this program:

- Involvement, study and agreement concerning the plan by teachers and parents.

- Committment to the plan by staff and parents and pupils.

- Staff development according to individual needs.

- Monitoring progress and providing individualized help for teachers as needed.

- Providing the necessary materials.

Things to avoid in adopting this program:

- Don't impose the plan.

- Follow the recommended procedures, otherwise adequate learning will not occur.

- Follow continuous progress testing as prescribed.

- Perform placement or diagnostic testing, as recommended. If in doubt, place the child at a lower level, since the program can be most successful when pupils achieve success. They can move along rapidly if the material is too easy, however being placed in instructional material that is too difficult can accentuate past failures.

Special Factors cont.

Phasing-in the program:

- If the program is not going to be implemented throughout the primary grades, it is best to start at the kindergarten level. Then the program can be extended upward in subsequent years. Probably more important is to identify teachers who are committed to the program, encourage them to go ahead -- providing whatever support is needed. As a success pattern is established, others may be motivated to use the program. Then the program can be extended upward in subsequent years.

  For individual pupils, the program can not be adopted piece meal. It requires the use of the BRL program as the main component, However, supplementary activities should be used -- especially to extend the comprehension skills.

  The program can be used with all types of children, but is especially effective with slow or disadvantaged learners.

Dissemination

Discuss how project information was disseminated during the past budget period.

1. Provide an estimate of the number of unsolicited requests for information from both within and outside the project area.

2. List the number of visitors from outside the project area.

3. Provide the cost of dissemination during the last budget period.

4. Provide the total cost of dissemination including prior budget periods (if possible).

Information about the project has been disseminated via a Parent Handbook (discussed in group and individual conferences), a newsletter in Spanish and English, teacher newsletters, copies of the annual report to the Board and all schools, demonstrations to the Board of Education, video taping presentations to all elementary schools in the District, and by local newspaper articles. Teachers and principals from other schools were released to observe the program in action and to consider the possibilities of implementation in their schools. Due to the success of this project, other schools in the District are now using the Sullivan materials. At our Kelso School alone, there have been 79 out-of-district professionals visiting the program from various sections of the country and Canada. There have been approximately 30 out-of-district requests for information about the project. Dissemination costs have approximated $1000.

3. EVALUATION

3.1 Choosing Participants:

Essentially, the same target population was included as last year's. This consists of all the pupils in grades kindergarten through 2 at Freeman School, kindergarten through 2nd and remedial reading pupils in grade 3 at Kelso School and St. John's, grade 3 pupils at Highland, and ungraded (K-3) pupils in the Orthopedic School. A comparison group has been maintained between a project and a control school throughout the project. Similar students are involved in each school. Participants in the program were not involved in other basic programs; however, some supplementary activities were included. Approximately 200 participants have left the program since September, due to family moves; new enrollees and 40 additional have replaced them at these schools. The attendance record of most pupils was excellent. The BRL individualized program was the basic reading program for all project pupils; however, the program was supplemented with other reading/teaching/learning.

The present evaluation group included all participating pupils in project schools as well as one comparison group at one non-project school.

3.2 Describing Participants:

All the pupils in target schools received the program. Approximately 1252 pupils participated. The grade levels included K through 3. As of June, 1973, the distribution of boys and girls was approximately equal. COOP Primary Reading Test results were available before the program started. As of June, 1973, the approximate ethnic backgrounds of participants was: Anglo 54%; Black 35%; Oriental 1%; Spanish surname 10%. Also, most participants come from low, middle or upper lower class socio-economic backgrounds.

3.3 Measuring Changes:

To determine the achievement of the program's aims, pre and post testing was used; viz. The Cooperative Primary Reading Tests for Grades 1 through 3. Additionally, continuous evaluation of pupil progress was done regularly through in-book, progress and comprehension tests with 80% mastery expected before progress to the next level. Monitoring was provided by BRL consultants, principals, project evaluator and Director. Each has special competence in evaluating successful reading programs. Results of the written testing and observation were compared to the objectives to determine if they had been met.

3.4 Presenting Data:

The data obtained from the measures applied include sums, numbers, percentages and averages. The measures of central tendency consist of means and/or medians. No measures of dispersion were used. Specific data are presented more clearly in the required and optional summary reporting forms.

3.5 Analyzing Data:

Data analyses consisted mainly of (1) comparisons with national and District norms, (2) comparisons between project and control groups, (3) assessment of success or failure in meeting objectives and (4) gains made from pre to post test.

The basis for judging the progress of the program group includes: the gain made between pre and post test data; comparison with national and District norms and with other District schools; opinions of teachers, parents, and administrators; and on-side monitoring observations.

3.6 Project Objectives and Findings:

0.0 The project objective or goal is to significantly reduce the number of children who are reading below grade level at the target schools.

Findings:

There has been approximately 16% reduction in target school pupils in grades 1, 2, 3, reading below grade level.

Illustratively, Miller-Unruh data indicate Grade 1 at Freeman registered only 14% at Q; at Kelso Grade 1 had 16% and Grade 2 had 15% at Q_1; at Highland Grade 3 had only 5% at Q_1.

0.1 By June, 1973, at least 80% of the kindergarten children who completed the Readiness in Language Arts program during the school year will score in the third quartile or above on the Metropolitan Readiness Test.

Findings:

Kelso School more than met this objective by 116% while Freeman School failed to do so, meeting it by 61%.

0.2 By June, 1973 at least 80% of the pupils who completed the Readiness program in kindergarten will during their second and third years in the program make no less than month-for-month gains after use of the Reading Phase.

Findings:

Highland School more than met this objective for grade 3 (109%), St. John's met it at Grade 1 (100%). With the possible exception of St. John's Grade 3 (75%) and Freeman Grade 2 (85%), the other schools for the appropriate grades met this objective if one considered error of measurement (93% to 97%). Please see break-down in EV 73.02).

0.3 By June, 1973, at least 80% of the First and Second Grade students who initially require the Readiness in Language Arts Program and move on to the Reading Series will be achieving month-for-month gains at the end of the first year and be at grade level by the end of their second or third year.

Findings:

Freeman for Grade 1 and St. John's for Grade 2, met this objective. Again, if we considered standard error of measurement, other grades for the schools involved could be taken as having met the objective. (Please see 73.02).

0.4 By June 1973, at least 80% of the 3rd Grade students who began the Reading Readiness Program in Books A & B will have achieved no less than the average second grade score by the end of their first year in the program.

Findings:

Kelso and Highland Schools met the objective. St. John's did not (75%).

0.5 By June 1973, students who began the program in Book 5 of above will double their rate of growth during the previous academic year in the first year of the project, and during the second and third year, these students will achieve month-for-month gains.

Findings:
Grade 1 at Kelso (125%), Grade 2 at Kelso (107%) and Grade 3 at Highland (119%) exceeded the objective. Grade 3 at Kelso (82%), Grade 2 at Freeman (83%), and Grade 2 at St. John's (86%) failed to meet the objective.

Additional Findings:
1. EV 73.01 data indicate project schools mostly exceeding national and District norms in terms of mean score. Most noteworthy is that of the kindergarten at Kelso which had a mean of 75 %ile on the Metropolitan Readiness Test and that for Grade 3 at Highland with a mean of 4.1 considering the restriction of range on the Grade 3 norms for the COOP Primary.
2. On the matched subsets for the comparison and project schools, the latter yielded greater pre-to-post gains; viz. .8 and .4 for the comparison school for Grades 2 and 3 respectively vs. 1.1 and .8 for the project school for Grades 2 and 3 respectively.
3. Our Miller-Unruh Data for 1973 also indicate superiority of results for project schools in terms of % scoring at or below Q_1 as compared with results from comparison and other non-project schools of the District. These results are summarized below:

May 1973 COOP Primary Test Results
(Q_1 and Below)

Schools	Grade 1 N	Grade 1 %	Grade 2 N	Grade 2 %	Grade 3 N	Grade 3 %
Inglewood Unified School District	253	30	306	33	352	37
Bennett	29	31	33	38	51	48
Center Park	108	42	98	40	135	51
Centinela	40	31	46	29	29	20
* Freeman	17	14	42	29		
* Highland					4	5
* Kelso	13	16	17	15	32	29
La Tijera					21	26
** Oak	26	32	31	30	45	43
Payne	23	26	29	37	35	51

* Project Schools ** Comparison School

The findings are generalizable and applicable to diverse types of pupils with varying needs (as we experienced in the project) if the planning, implementing and monitoring of the project activities are similarly replicated.

The causative factors for unmet objectives are:

1. In the case of the kindergarten class at one school, proportionately fewer pupils were at Book 6 or completing the Readiness in Language Arts program. Here, only 27% of the pupils were at Book 6 or completed the program. At the more successful school which exceeded the objective, 44% were completing it or at Book 6.

2. The rate of pupil transiency at some schools and teacher turnover at others could, in part, be considered a contributory factor.

3. Several of the pupils who failed to meet the objectives did so only within standard errors of measurement, i.e., by one or two raw scores.

4. The fallibility inherent in the measuring instrument is likewise a factor. The COOP Primary Reading Test consists of separate and independent tests for each of the grade levels and the norms for Grade 3 are restricted in range, e.g., a raw score of 50 at grade 1 is assigned a G.E. of 4.9; at both grades 2 and 3, the identical raw score has a G.E. of 5.0.

The other important findings which were not initially anticipated were:

1. The carry-over effect of the program on the spelling and writing skills of the pupils as reported by the teachers.

2. The improvement in motivation towards reading and in classroom discipline as reported by the teachers.

3. The positive changes in the behavior of teachers and their attitudes towards the pupils as reported by the principals and as observed during monitoring visitations.

4. The absence of the Hawthorne effect during the subsequent years.

5. The program's capability to meet varying needs of diverse types of children as seen in the case of bilinguals, transients, slow learners, and orthopedically handicapped.

SUMMARY OF MEASUREMENT DATA BY GRADE LEVEL

Duplicate as needed and indicate type of report.

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

FOR PROJECT SCHOOL NO. 6 0 1 4 4 9 2
FOR COMPARISON SCHOOL NO. — — — — — — —
FOR ALL PROJECT SCHOOLS —
FOR ALL COMPARISON SCHOOLS —

	Pre-test Information				Post-test Information				Pre-Post Differences			
Grade level* (1)	Pre-test month (2)	Code No. of test & subject** (3)	Number pre-tested (4)	Mean score (5)	Post-test month (6)	Code No. of test & sub-ject (7)	Number post-tested (8)	Mean Score (9)	Percent taking both pre- and post-tests (10)	Difference (Col. 9 minus Col. 5) (11)	Type of score*** (12)	State Use Only (13)
Pre												
K	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	May, 1973	23 *	87	75	XXXX	XXXX	% ile	
1	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	"	05	82	2.1	XXXX	XXXX	G.E.	
2	May'72	05	85	1.9	"	05	109	3.1	78	1.2	G.E.	
3	May'72	05	81	2.9	"	05	111	3.7	73	.8	G.E.	
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												

xxxx = no pre-test 23 * = Metropolitan Readiness Test (Form A)

* When multiple measures are to be reported for a single grade level, revise column (1) using additional lines as needed.
** Use the test list (EV. 73.12); insert an asterisk if a sub-test is used, and give its name.
*** Where appropriate, use a scaled score (otherwise, write in Raw score). Indicate the scale used; G.E. for grade equivalent, %ile for percentile equivalents, stend for standard scores, scaled for scaled scores, Freq. for frequency coun

EV 73.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF MEASUREMENT DATA BY GRADE LEVEL

Duplicate as needed and indicate type of report.

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

FOR PROJECT SCHOOL NO. 6 0 1 4 4 6 8
FOR COMPARISON SCHOOL NO. — — — — — — —
FOR ALL PROJECT SCHOOLS —
FOR ALL COMPARISON SCHOOLS —

	Pre-test Information				Post-test Information				Pre-Post Differences			
Grade Level* (1)	Pre-test month (2)	Code No. of test & subject** (3)	Number pre-tested (4)	Mean score (5)	Post-test month (6)	Code No. of test & sub-ject (7)	Number post-tested (8)	Mean Score (9)	Percent taking both pre- and post-tests (10)	Difference (Col. 9 minus Col. 5) (11)	Type of score*** (12)	State Use Only (13)
Pre												
K	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	May'73	23 *	141	55	xxxx	xxxx	% ile	
1	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	May'73	05	118	2.0	xxxx	xxxx	G.E.	
2	May'72	05	124	2.0	May'73	05	143	2.8	88	.8	G.E.	
3												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												

xxxx = no pre-test

* When multiple measures are to be reported for a single grade level, revise column (1) using additional lines as needed.

** Use the test list (EV. 73.12); insert an asterisk if a sub-test is used, and give its name.

*** Where appropriate, use a scaled score (otherwise, write in Raw score). Indicate the scale used; G.E. for grade equivalent, %ile for percentile equivalents, stand for standard scores, scaled for scaled scores, Freq. for frequency count

EV 73.01

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF MEASUREMENT DATA BY GRADE LEVEL

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

Duplicate as needed and indicate type of report.

FOR PROJECT SCHOOL NO. 6 0 1 4 4 7 6
FOR COMPARISON SCHOOL NO. — — — — — — —
FOR ALL PROJECT SCHOOLS —
FOR ALL COMPARISON SCHOOLS —

	Pre-test Information				Post-test Information				Pre-Post Differences			
Grade level* (1)	Pre-test month (2)	Code No. of test & subject** (3)	Number pre-tested (4)	Mean score (5)	Post-test month (6)	Code No. of test & subject (7)	Number post-tested (8)	Mean Score (9)	Percent taking both pre- and post-tests (10)	Difference (Col. 9 minus Col. 5) (11)	Type of score*** (12)	State Use Only (13)
Pre												
K												
1												
2												
3	May'72	05	49	2.5	May'73	05	61	4.1	80	1.6	G.E.	
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

* When multiple measures are to be reported for a single grade level, revise column (1) using additional lines as needed.
** Use the test list (EV. 73.12); insert an asterisk if a sub-test is used, and give its name.
*** Where appropriate, use a scaled score (otherwise, write in Raw score). Indicate the scale used; G.E. for grade equivalent, %ile for percentile equivalents, stand for standard scores, scaled for scaled scores, Freq. for frequency coun

SUMMARY OF MEASUREMENT DATA BY GRADE LEVEL

Duplicate as needed and indicate type of report.

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

FOR PROJECT SCHOOL NO.
FOR COMPARISON SCHOOL NO. 6 0 1 4 5 3 4
FOR ALL PROJECT SCHOOLS —
FOR ALL COMPARISON SCHOOLS —

	Pre-test Information				Post-test Information				Pre-Post Differences			
Grade level* (1)	Pre-test month (2)	Code No. of test & subject** (3)	Number pre-tested (4)	Mean score (5)	Post-test month (6)	Code No. of test & subject (7)	Number post-tested (8)	Mean Score (9)	Percent taking both pre- and post-tests (10)	Difference (Col. 9 minus Col. 5) (11)	Type of score*** (12)	State Use Only (13)
Pre												
K												
1	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	May'73	05	81	1.8	xxxx	xxxx	G.E.	
2	May'72	05	103	1.8	May'73	05	104	2.6	99	.8	G.E.	
3	May'72	05	99	2.6	May'73	05	104	3.1	95	.5	G.E.	
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

xxxx = no pre-test

* When multiple measures are to be reported for a single grade level, revise column (1) using additional lines as needed.

** Use the test list (EV. 73.12); insert an asterisk if a sub-test is used, and give its name.

*** Where appropriate, use a scaled score (otherwise, write in Raw score). Indicate the scale used; G.E. for grade equivalent, %ile for percentile equivalents, stand for standard scores, scaled for scaled scores, Freq. for frequency coun

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL
ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

SUMMARY OF MEASUREMENT DATA BY GRADE LEVEL

Duplicate as needed and indicate type of report.

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

FOR PROJECT SCHOOL NO. _ _ _ _ _ _ _
FOR COMPARISON SCHOOL NO. _ _ _ _ _ _ _
FOR ALL PROJECT SCHOOLS _
FOR ALL COMPARISON SCHOOLS _

	Pre-test Information				Post-test Information				Pre-Post Differences			
Grade level* (1)	Pre-test month (2)	Code No. of test & subject** (3)	Number pre-tested (4)	Mean score (5)	Post-test month (6)	Code No. of test & sub-ject (7)	Number post-tested (8)	Mean Score (9)	Percent taking both pre- and post-tests (10)	Difference (Col. 9 minus Col. 5) (11)	Type of score*** (12)	State Use Only (13)
Pre												
K												
1	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	May'73	05	64	2.0	xxxx	xxxx	G.E.	
2	May'72	05	55	2.0	May'73	05	74	3.1	74	1.1	G.E.	
3	May'72	05	56	3.3	May'73	05	74	3.7	76	.4	G.E.	
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

xxxx = no pre-test

* When multiple measures are to be reported for a single grade level, revise column (1) using additional lines as needed.

** Use the test list (EV. 73.12); insert an asterisk if a sub-test is used, and give its name.

*** Where appropriate, use a scaled score (otherwise, write in Raw score). Indicate the scale used; G.E. for grade equivalent, %ile for percentile equivalents, stand for standard scores, scaled for scaled scores, Freq. for frequency coun

SUMMARY OF MEASUREMENT DATA BY GRADE LEVEL

Duplicate as needed and indicate type of report.

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

FOR PROJECT SCHOOL NO. — — — — — — —
FOR COMPARISON SCHOOL NO. — — — — — — —
FOR ALL PROJECT SCHOOLS X
FOR ALL COMPARISON SCHOOLS —

	Pre-test Information				Post-test Information				Pre-Post Differences			
Grade level* (1)	Pre-test month (2)	Code No. of test & subject** (3)	Number pre-tested (4)	Mean score (5)	Post-test month (6)	Code No. of test & subject (7)	Number post-tested (8)	Mean Score (9)	Percent taking both pre- and post-tests (10)	Difference (Col. 9 minus Col. 5) (11)	Type of score*** (12)	State Use Only (13)
Pre												
K	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	May'73	23*	228	63	xxxx	xxxx	% ile	
1	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	xxxx	May'73	05	264	2.0	xxxx	xxxx	G.E.	
2	May'72	05	264	2.0	May'73	05	326	3.0	81	1.0	G.E.	
3	May'72	05	185	3.0	May'73	05	246	3.8	75	.8	G.E.	
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

xxxx = no pre-test 23 * = Metropolitan Readiness (Form A)

* When multiple measures are to be reported for a single grade level, revise column (1) using additional lines as needed.

** Use the test list (EV. 73.12); insert an asterisk if a sub-test is used, and give its name.

*** Where appropriate, use a scaled score (otherwise, write in Raw score). Indicate the scale used; G.E. for grade equivalent, %ile for percentile equivalents, stand for standard scores, scaled for scaled scores, Freq. for frequency cou

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES ACCOMPLISHED

Objectives: Record project objectives first, draw a line and enter the interim objectives Record a brief description (Include quantification)* (1)	Type of measure selected (code from Form EV 73.12) (2)	Criteria for success (record by number)** (3)	Accomplishment of Objectives: State yes or no (and %)*** (4)	Successful areas (i.e., grade levels and schools)**** (5)	Unsuccessful areas (i.e., grade levels and schools)**** (6)	Estimated cost to date (for interim objectives only) (7)	Stat use (8)
0.0 The project objective or goal is to significantly reduce the number of children reading below grade level of the target schools.	Standardized Reading Test (05)	3	Yes (100%)	Grades K, 1, 2, 3 at <u>all</u> project schools			
0.1 By June '73, at least 80% of kindergartners who completed the Readiness in Language Arts program during school year will score in 3rd quartile or above on <u>Metropolitan Readiness</u>	23 *	1	Yes (116%)	K (Kelso School)			
	23 *	1	No (61%)		K (Freeman School)		

*Record degree of success anticipated.
**Number 1 Reach desired level of performance, No. 2 Exceed comparison group, No. 3 Past performance from baseline data.
***Percentage as stated in narrative, i.e., 80% of participants will --- 80% in this case equals 100% of objectives.
****Applies to measures of participants only, i.e., Washington school (2,3, and 5).

23 * = Metropolitan Readiness

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES ACCOMPLISHED

Objectives: Record project objectives first, draw a line and enter the interim objectives Record a brief description (Include quantification)* (1)	Type of measure selected (code from Form EV 73.12) (2)	Criteria for success (record by number)** (3)	Accomplishment of Objectives: State yes or no (and %)*** (4)	Accomplishment of Objectives: Successful areas (i.e., grade levels and schools)**** (5)	Accomplishment of Objectives: Unsuccessful areas (i.e., grade levels and schools)**** (6)	Estimated cost to date (for interim objectives only) (7)	State use (8)
0.2 By June 1973, at least 80% of the pupils who completed the Readiness program in Kindergarten will during their second and third years in the program make no less than month/month gains after use of the Reading phase.	05	1	Yes (109%) No (97%) No (75%) No (96%) No (93%) No (83%) Yes (100%) No (94%) No (97%)	3 (Highland School) 1 (St. John)	3 (Kelso Sch.) 3 (St.John) 2 (St.John) 2 (Kelso) 2 (Freeman) 1 (Kelso) 1 (Freeman)		

*Record degree of success anticipated.
**Number 1 Reach desired level of performance, No. 2 Exceed comparison group, No. 3 Past performance from baseline data.
***Percentage as stated in narrative, i.e., 80% of participants will --- 80% in this case equals 100% of objectives.
****Applies to measures of participants only, i.e., Washington school (2,3, and 5).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES ACCOMPLISHED

Objectives: Record project objectives first, draw a line and enter the interim objectives Record a brief description (Include quantification)* (1)	Type of measure selected (code from Form EV 73.12) (2)	Criteria for success (record by number)** (3)	Accomplishment of Objectives: State yes or no (and %)*** (4)	Accomplishment of Objectives: Successful areas (i.e., grade levels and schools)**** (5)	Accomplishment of Objectives: Unsuccessful areas (i.e., grade levels and schools)**** (6)	Estimated cost to date (for interim objectives only) (7)	State use (8)
0.3 By June 1973, at least 80% of the 1st and 2nd grade students who initially require the Readiness in Language Arts Program and move on to the Reading Series will be achieving month/month gains at the end of the first year and be at grade level by the end of their 2nd or 3rd year.	Standardized Reading Test (05)	1	Yes (100%) No (85%) No (86%) Yes (100%) No (93%)	1 (Freeman) 2 (St.John)	 1 (Kelso) 1 (St. John) 2 (Kelso)		

*Record degree of success anticipated.
**Number 1 Reach desired level of performance, No. 2 Exceed comparison group, No. 3 Past performance from baseline data.
***Percentage as stated in narrative, i.e., 80% of participants will --- 80% in this case equals 100% of objectives.
****Applies to measures of participants only, i.e., Washington school (2,3, and 5).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES ACCOMPLISHED

Objectives: Record project objectives first, draw a line and enter the interim objectives Record a brief description (Include quantification)* (1)	Type of measure selected (code from Form EV 73.12) (2)	Criteria for success (record by number)** (3)	Accomplishment of Objectives: State yes or no (and %)*** (4)	Accomplishment of Objectives: Successful areas (i.e., grade levels and schools)**** (5)	Accomplishment of Objectives: Unsuccessful areas (i.e., grade levels and schools)**** (6)	Estimated cost to date (for interim objectives only) (7)	Stat use (8)
0.4 By June 1973, at least 80% of the 3rd grade students who began the Reading Readiness Program in Books A or B will have achieved no less than the average second grade score by the end of their first year in the program.	Standardized Reading Test (05)	1	Yes (100%) Yes (100%) No (75%)	3 (Kelso) 3 (Highland)	3 (St.John)		

*Record degree of success anticipated.
**Number 1 Reach desired level of performance, No. 2 Exceed comparison group, No. 3 Past performance from baseline data.
***Percentage as stated in narrative, i.e., 80% of participants will --- 80% in this case equals 100% of objectives.
****Applies to measures of participants only, i.e., Washington school (2,3, and 5).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EV 7

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES ACCOMPLISHED

Objectives: Record project objectives first, draw a line and enter the interim objectives Record a brief description (Include quantification)* (1)	Type of measure selected (code from Form EV 73.12) (2)	Criteria for success (record by number)** (3)	Accomplishment of Objectives			Estimated cost to date (for interim objectives only) (7)	Sta us (8
			State yes or no (and %)*** (4)	Successful areas (i.e., grade levels and schools)**** (5)	Unsuccessful areas (i.e., grade levels and schools)**** (6)		
0.5 By June '73, students who began the program in Book 5 or above will double their rate of growth during the previous academic year in the first year of the project, and during the second and third year, these students will achieve month/ month gains	Standardized Reading Test (05)	1	Yes (125%) No (83%) Yes (107%) No (86%) Yes (119%) No *82%)	1 (Kelso) 2 (Kelso) 3 (Highland)	2 (Freeman) 2 (St. John) 3 (Kelso)		

*Record degree of success anticipated.
**Number 1 Reach desired level of performance, No. 2 Exceed comparison group, No. 3 Past performance from baseline data.
***Percentage as stated in narrative, i.e., 80% of participants will --- 80% in this case equals 100% of objectives.
****Applies to measures of participants only, i.e., Washington school (2,3, and 5).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

By type indicated in column (1), briefly record program elements in column (2) and (4), which characterize the programs

Type of Program Element (examples follow each) (1)	The Regular Program (for the prior year or comparison group) (2)	The Project's Program Type* (3)	The Project's Program Program elements used (4)	State Use (5)
1. Staffing and their Deployment Indicate regular and support personnel, by grade level and school.	Kelso School Gr. K - 4 teachers Gr. 1 - 3 teachers Gr. 2 - 4 teachers Gr. 3 - 4 teachers	2	Every teacher at each grade level had one hour of aide time daily	
2. Learning materials Basic textbooks, supplementing materials (project or commerically prepared), and special equipment.	State Basal Reading Series supplemented by commercial and teacher-made materials (grades 1, 2, 3) as well as teacher's reading guide with new State textbooks	1	Project diagnostic-prescriptive materials for basic skill areas in reading (BRL Sullivan Programmed Reading) supplemented by teacher-made materials developed at BRL sponsored In-service and Workshops.	
3. Instructional methodology Procedures for instruction; i.e., use of grouping, learning stations, individual contracts, pull out labs, and peer teaching.	Primarily, use of three or more reading groups with teacher rotating to one group at a time while other groups did other activities (at all grade levels).	1	Continuous monitoring of individual pupil reading progress, cooperative placement in appropriate unit or learning level of reading material, teacher and aide guidance of pupils individually and in small groups, pupils testing and scoring daily progress, teachers and aides administering periodic tests for recycling purposes.	

*Explain the use of the project elements described in column 4; insert a (1) if they replace those for the regular program, or a (2) if they are a modification or addition to it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

By type indicated in column (1), briefly record program elements in column (2) and (4), which characterize the programs

Type of Program Element (examples follow each) (1)	The Regular Program (for the prior year or comparison group) (2)	The Project's Program		State Use (5)
		Type* (3)	Program elements used (4)	
1. Staffing and their Deployment Indicate regular and support personnel, by grade level and school.	Freeman School Grade K - 5 teachers Grade 1 - 5 teachers Grade 2 - 5 teachers	2	Every teacher at each grade level had one hour of aide time daily.	
2. Learning materials Basic textbooks, supplementing materials (project or commerically prepared), and special equipment.	See identical narrative on Kelso.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso.	
3. Instructional methodalogy Procedures for instruction; i.e., use of grouping, learning stations, individual contracts, pull out labs, and peer teaching.	See identical narrative on Kelso.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso.	

*Explain the use of the project elements described in column 4; insert a (1) if they replace those for the regular program, or a (2) if they are a modification or addition to it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

By type indicated in column (1), briefly record program elements in column (2) and (4), which characterize the programs

Type of Program Element (examples follow each) (1)	The Regular Program (for the prior year or comparison group) (2)	The Project's Program Type* (3)	The Project's Program Program elements used (4)	State Use (5)
1. Staffing and their Deployment Indicate regular and support personnel, by grade level and school.	St. John Chrysostom Grade 1 - 2 teachers Grade 2 - 2 teachers Grade 3 - 2 teachers	2	Every teacher at each grade level had onehour of aide time daily.	
2. Learning materials Basic textbooks, supplementing materials (project or commerically prepared), and special equipment.	See identical narrative on Kelso.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso.	
3. Instructional methodalogy Procedures for instruction; i.e., use of grouping, learning stations, individual contracts, pull out labs, and peer teaching.	See identical narrative on Kelso.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso.	

*Explain the use of the project elements described in column 4; insert a (1) if they replace those for the regular program, or a (2) if they are a modification or addition to it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

By type indicated in column (1), briefly record program elements in column (2) and (4), which characterize the programs

Type of Program Element (examples follow each) (1)	The Regular Program (for the prior year or comparison group) (2)	The Project's Program Type* (3)	The Project's Program Program elements used (4)	State Use (5)
1. Staffing and their Deployment Indicate regular and support personnel, by grade level and school.	Highland School Grade 3 - 4 teachers	2	Every teacher had one hour of aide time daily.	
2. Learning materials Basic textbooks, supplementing materials (project or commerically prepared), and special equipment.	See identical narrative on Kelso.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso.	
3. Instructional methodalogy Procedures for instruction; i.e., use of grouping, learning stations, individual contracts, pull out labs, and peer teaching.	See identical narrative on Kelso.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso.	

*Explain the use of the project elements described in column 4; insert a (1) if they replace those for the regular program, or a (2) if they are a modification or addition to it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

By type indicated in column (1), briefly record program elements in column (2) and (4), which characterize the programs

Type of Program Element (examples follow each) (1)	The Regular Program (for the prior year or comparison group) (2)	The Project's Program Type* (3)	The Project's Program Program elements used (4)	State Use (5)
1. Staffing and their Deployment Indicate regular and support personnel, by grade level and school.	Orthopedic School Grade K - 1 teacher Grade 1 - 2 teacher Grade 2 - 1 teacher Grade 3 - 1 teacher	2	Every teacher at each grade level had one hour of aide time daily.	
2. Learning materials Basic textbooks, supplementing materials (project or commerically prepared), and special equipment.	See identical narrative on Kelso.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso.	
3. Instructional methodalogy Procedures for instruction; i.e., use of grouping, learning stations, individual contracts, pull out labs, and peer teaching.	See identical narrative on Kelso.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso.	

*Explain the use of the project elements described in column 4; insert a (1) if they replace those for the regular program, or a (2) if they are a modification or addition to it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

By type indicated in column (1), briefly record program elements in column (2) and (4), which characterize the programs

Type of Program Element (examples follow each) (1)	The Regular Program (for the prior year or comparison group) (2)	The Project's Program Type* (3)	The Project's Program Program elements used (4)	State Use (5)
4. Procedures for Individualizing Instruction Periodic assignment of participants to learning experiences (based on staff judgement, pupil test scores, diagnostic profiles, pupil selection).	Kelso School Based on teacher judgment, pupils may move to another reading group.	1	A highly individualized, sequentially systematic program is used for basic reading skills; enhancement is through correlated recreational and comprehension readers. Pupils progress at own rate. Continuous in-book and progress tests monitor pupils assignments.	
5. Staff Development Inservice experiences for improving skills and knowledge.	Teachers receive both building and district in-service orientation to new materials or procedures at the beginning of and through the year.	2	A 2 day in-service for principals and a 3 day workshop for teachers prior to school opening, covering project materials and diagnostic-prescriptive procedures on individualized reading instruction. Additionally BRL Consultants helped teachers on initial pupil placement and continuing in-service and workshops on schedule and on demand during the school year.	
6. Auxiliary Services Library, health, pupil personnel services, and parent involvement.	The school has library, nurse, counselor, reading resource teacher and other auxiliary services.	2	Reading resource teachers served additionally as materials coordinator at the building. Parents briefed on program and pupil progress through group and individual conferences and periodic newsletters.	
7. Other				

*Explain the use of the project elements described in column 4; insert a (1) if they replace those for the regular program, or a (2) if they are a modification or addition to it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

By type indicated in column (1), briefly record program elements in column (2) and (4), which characterize the programs

Type of Program Element (examples follow each) (1)	The Regular Program (for the prior year or comparison group) (2)	The Project's Program Type* (3)	The Project's Program Program elements used (4)	State Use (5)
4. Procedures for Individualizing Instruction Periodic assignment of participants to learning experiences (based on staff judgement, pupil test scores, diagnostic profiles, pupil selection).	Highland School See identical narrative on Kelso School.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
5. Staff Development Inservice experiences for improving skills and knowledge.	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	2	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
6. Auxiliary Services Library, health, pupil personnel services, and parent involvement.	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	2	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
7. Other				

*Explain the use of the project elements described in column 4; insert a (1) if they replace those for the regular program, or a (2) if they are a modification or addition to it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

By type indicated in column (1), briefly record program elements in column (2) and (4), which characterize the programs

Type of Program Element (examples follow each) (1)	The Regular Program (for the prior year or comparison group) (2)	The Project's Program Type* (3)	The Project's Program Program elements used (4)	State Use (5)
4. Procedures for Individualizing Instruction Periodic assignment of participants to learning experiences (based on staff judgement, pupil test scores, diagnostic profiles, pupil selection).	Freeman School See identical narrative on Kelso School.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
5. Staff Development Inservice experiences for improving skills and knowledge.	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	2	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
6. Auxiliary Services Library, health, pupil personnel services, and parent involvement.	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	2	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
7. Other				

*Explain the use of the project elements described in column 4; insert a (1) if they replace those for the regular program, or a (2) if they are a modification or addition to it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

By type indicated in column (1), briefly record program elements in column (2) and (4), which characterize the programs

Type of Program Element (examples follow each) (1)	The Regular Program (for the prior year or comparison group) (2)	The Project's Program		State Use (5)
		Type* (3)	Program elements used (4)	
4. Procedures for Individualizing Instruction Periodic assignment of participants to learning experiences (based on staff judgement, pupil test scores, diagnostic profiles, pupil selection).	St. John Chrysostom School See identical narrative on Kelso School.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
5. Staff Development Inservice experiences for improving skills and knowledge.	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	2	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
6. Auxiliary Services Library, health, pupil personnel services, and parent involvement.	The school has library and part time support services	2	Principal and teacher served as materials coordinator at the building. Parents briefed on program, etc.	
7. Other				

*Explain the use of the project elements described in column 4; insert a (1) if they replace those for the regular program, or a (2) if they are a modification or addition to it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

55

PROJECT NUMBER 0 4 0 3

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS

By type indicated in column (1), briefly record program elements in column (2) and (4), which characterize the programs

Type of Program Element (examples follow each) (1)	The Regular Program (for the prior year or comparison group) (2)	The Project's Program Type* (3)	The Project's Program Program elements used (4)	State Use (5)
4. Procedures for Individualizing Instruction Periodic assignment of participants to learning experiences (based on staff judgement, pupil test scores, diagnostic profiles, pupil selection).	Orthopedic School See identical narrative on Kelso School.	1	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
5. Staff Development Inservice experiences for improving skills and knowledge.	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	2	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
6. Auxiliary Services Library, health, pupil personnel services, and parent involvement.	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	2	See identical narrative on Kelso School.	
7. Other				

*Explain the use of the project elements described in column 4; insert a (1) if they replace those for the regular program, or a (2) if they are a modification or addition to it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE